

Translation

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference P11039WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/EP2003/008239	International filing date (day/month/year) 25 July 2003 (25.07.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 25 July 2002 (25.07.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC B21D 45/00		
Applicant WEIGELT, Harald		

1.	This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of <u>5</u> sheets, including this cover sheet. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT). These annexes consist of a total of <u>4</u> sheets.
3.	This report contains indications relating to the following items: I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the report II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority III <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability IV <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 23 February 2004 (23.02.2004)	Date of completion of this report 15 October 2004 (15.10.2004)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP Facsimile No.	Authorized officer Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP2003/008239

I. Basis of the report

1. This report has been drawn on the basis of *(Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to the report since they do not contain amendments.)*:

- ☐ the international application as originally filed.
- ☒ the description, pages 1-22, as originally filed,
 pages _____, filed with the demand,
 pages _____, filed with the letter of _____,
 pages _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims, Nos. _____, as originally filed,
 Nos. _____, as amended under Article 19,
 Nos. _____, filed with the demand,
 Nos. 1-15, filed with the letter of 13 July 2004 (13.07.2004),
 Nos. _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig 1/4-4/4, as originally filed,
 sheets/fig _____, filed with the demand,
 sheets/fig _____, filed with the letter of _____,
 sheets/fig _____, filed with the letter of _____.

2. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig _____

3. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP2003/008239

III. Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application.
- ☐ claims Nos. _____

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____
relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

- ☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____
are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported
by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

- ☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____ 6

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP 03/08239

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-5, 7-15	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-5, 7-15	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-5, 7-15	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

The stripping device known from US-A-2168377 (D1) is regarded as the closest prior art. This stripping device corresponds to the stripping device indicated in the preamble of claim 1 and, furthermore, shows the feature in the characterizing part of claim 1 that an anti-twist device is provided for substantially preventing the stripping element from rotating.

Therefore, the subject matter of claim 1 differs from the known stripping device in that in the anti-twist arrangement the stripping element is asymmetrically paired, in at least one direction, with a hole or an opening in the guide element for inserting the stripping element, in order to ensure that the stripping element is inserted with a one-to-one orientation.

Therefore, the subject matter of independent claim 1 is novel (PCT Article 33(2)).

The problem to be solved by the present invention can be regarded as that of providing improved twist prevention.

The solution to this problem as proposed in claim 1 of the present application involves an inventive step (PCT

Article 33(3)). None of the documents cited in the search report discloses that in an anti-twist arrangement the stripping element is asymmetrically paired, in at least one direction, with a hole or an opening in the guide element for inserting the stripping element, in order to ensure that the stripping element is inserted with a one-to-one orientation.

Therefore, proceeding from a stripping device according to D1, the prior art contains nothing that suggests a device according to claim 1.

Claims 2-5 and 7-15 are dependent on claim 1 and therefore likewise meet the PCT requirements for novelty and inventive step.